

BX 5136

S72B9 13

A P P E N D

TO

Chas
MR. BUTLER
"

Vindication of "The Book
Catholic Church

IN REPLY TO

DR. SOUTHERN

Preface to his "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ"

LONDON :

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET,

M.DCCC.XXVI.

36
9 Rev^d John Steel.

ENDIX

2- 12461

TO

UTLER'S

*the Book of the Roman
Church,"*

EPLY TO

UTHEY'S

ciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ."

NDON :

ALBEMARLE-STREET.

CCCLXXVI.

BX 5136

S72B9

WASI -S

Luke Hansard & Sons,
near Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London.

APPENDIX,

&c.

THE first edition of Dr. Southey's "Book of the Church" contains the following relation :

" On the day when Ridley and Latimer suffered at Oxford, the Duke of Norfolk dined with Gardiner, and the dinner was delayed some hours, till the bishop's servant arrived from Oxford, post haste, with tidings that he had seen fire set to them; Gardiner went exultingly to the Duke of Norfolk with the news, and said, ' Now let us go to dinner ! ' Before he rose from table he was stricken with a painful disease, and being carried to his bed, lay there in intolerable torments for fifteen days."

In the second edition of Dr. Southey's "Book of the Church," the relation is wholly omitted, and no mention whatever made of it.

Both the first and second edition of Mr. Butler's "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," contain the following passage :

" I have now to mention an instance, in which
" to aggravate the conduct of Queen Mary's
" government, and the odium which you think it
" should bring upon the Roman Catholics, you
" introduce *a perfect fancy piece*. You tell us
" that, ' on the day on which Ridley and Latimer
" ' suffered at Oxford, the Duke of Norfolk dined
" ' with Gardiner; and that the dinner was de-
" ' layed some hours, till the bishop's servant
" ' arrived from Oxford, post haste, with tidings
" ' that he had seen fire set to them; that Gar-
" ' diner went exultingly to the Duke of Norfolk
" ' with the news, and said, ' Now let us go to
" ' dinner;' that before he rose from table he
" ' was stricken with a painful disease, and, being
" ' carried to his bed, lay there in intolerable tor-
" ' ments for fifteen days!' . . . and died. This
" tale was quickly confuted. The author of Fox's
" life, in the *Biographia Britannica*, mentions it
" among the many facts, in the relation of which
" Fox is not to be depended upon. ' To disprove
" ' this tragical story, it may,' says the biographer,
" ' be sufficient to observe, that Gardiner appeared
" ' in the House of Lords *after* he is reported to
" ' have been seized with the mortal distemper;

“ ‘ and the *old* Duke of Norfolk had been dead
 “ ‘ above a year, when Fox makes him at dinner
 “ ‘ with the Bishop of Winchester; for he died at
 “ ‘ Framlingham castle, September 1554, and was
 “ ‘ succeeded by his grandson, who could not then
 “ ‘ be an *old duke* as the story says. As to
 “ ‘ Gardiner, he died of the gout, and not of a
 “ ‘ suppression of urine, as Fox says.’ The
 “ ‘ important epithet *old*, by which the Duke of
 “ ‘ Norfolk is described, *you omit*. The falsehood
 “ ‘ of the story was noticed by Dr. Lingard; still
 “ ‘ it found its place in the first edition of your
 “ ‘ work. Articles afterwards appeared in dif-
 “ ‘ ferent newspapers, shewing the falsehood of Fox’s
 “ ‘ narrative: *you* have, however, retained it in
 “ ‘ your second edition; and long may it there re-
 “ ‘ main, as proof of the little reliance that should
 “ ‘ be placed on those writers who place *their* trust
 “ ‘ in Fox.”

In his Preface to the “ *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ*
 “ *Anglicanæ*,” Doctor Southey expresses himself
 as follows :

“ A few days after the ‘ *Book of the Church*’
 “ was published, I called on the friend to whom
 “ this volume is inscribed, and heard from him of
 “ a letter in the newspapers, shewing that a story
 “ concerning Gardiner’s death, which I had taken

“ from Fox, could not be true. I was on the point
“ of leaving town; and when shortly afterwards
“ a second edition of the work was called for, and
“ the publisher wrote to ask whether any alterations
“ were to be made, I gave directions for
“ expunging the passage, without troubling myself
“ to inquire into a question which I had no immediate
“ means of investigating. It may be imagined then, with what surprise I perused the
“ following passage in Mr. Butler’s Letters;
“ ‘ the falsehood of the story was noticed by Dr.
“ ‘ Lingard; still it found its place in the first
“ ‘ edition of your work. Articles afterwards
“ ‘ appeared in different newspapers, showing the
“ ‘ falsehood of Fox’s narrative; *you* have however
“ ‘ retained it in your second edition, and long
“ ‘ may it there remain, as proof of the little
“ ‘ reliance that should be placed on those writers
“ ‘ who place their trust in Fox.’ ”

“ What could I suppose upon reading this
“ positive assertion, but that the directions which
“ I had sent to Mr. Murray, must have been mistaken or overlooked; that the fact was as Mr.
“ Butler had stated it; and that a charge affecting my integrity as an historian, was brought
“ against me, of which I knew myself innocent,
“ and yet must appear to stand convicted? Under
“ this apprehension, I referred to the second edition,
“ and found, hardly with less surprise than the

“ charge itself had excited, that the passage was
“ *not* there; that my directions had been duly
“ observed; and that Mr. Butler's assertion so
“ positively made, so pointedly applied, was,
“ —(what shall I say?)—like many others of his
“ assertions. He had not thought it necessary
“ to ascertain the fact for himself, but had hazard-
“ ed this broad unqualified accusation upon the
“ faith of others, who either knew not or cared
“ what they said.

“ Convicted, however, I must have stood in
“ the opinion of the public, if I had not thus
“ casually heard of the communication in the
“ newspapers; for I never saw that letter, nor
“ heard of it from any other quarter. I had not
“ seen Dr. Lingard's fifth volume, in which his
“ remarks upon the story are contained; and I had
“ forgotten that the mistake in Fox was pointed
“ out in Collyer's Ecclesiastical History, not hav-
“ ing referred to that author when engaged upon
“ the Marian persecution, nor having noted the
“ passage, when I went through his work, many
“ years ago. Any man's character may be en-
“ dangered by a conspiracy against it, or by a
“ scheme of settled falsehood; but till this inci-
“ dent occurred, I was hardly aware how seriously,
“ in such a case as this, it might be affected by
“ accident.

“ The truth or falsehood of the story was in
“ itself of no importance. It could neither affect
“ the reputation of John Fox, who recorded the
“ sufferings of our martyrs, nor of Stephen Gar-
“ diner, who had so great a share in inflicting
“ them. Fox tells us on whose authority he re-
“ lated the anecdote. And whether the disease
“ of which Gardiner died, came on him like an
“ immediate stroke of divine vengeance, or un-
“ perceived in the ordinary course of nature, the
“ character of that crafty and hard-hearted man
“ remains the same, and is as odious as it deserves
“ to be. I inserted it, believing it to be true,
“ and, upon hearing that in one point it was cer-
“ tainly erroneous, I expunged it, little thinking
“ I should ever have occasion to notice it again,
“ still less that I should be accused of bringing
“ forward and retaining an anecdote which I knew
“ to be false, for to that Mr. Butler’s accusation
“ amounts. In his book, which conveys in the
“ smoothest language the most insidious misre-
“ presentations,—which is not more plausible in
“ manner than disengenuous in matter,—not more
“ courteous and complimentary in its terms, than
“ injurious in its spirit and design—I should
“ have been sorry if there had been a single
“ charge which I could not refute, as easily as
“ I can unravel its sophistry, and as completely
“ as I can lay open the fallacy of its statements.”

Immediately after these passages came under Mr. Butler's eye, he addressed to Dr. Southey, the following letter :—

“ Sir,

“ I HAVE just received your *Vindiciæ Ecc. Ang.*
“ from Mr. Murray, and I was surprised to read
“ in your Preface the charge you bring against me
“ of saying, that ‘ You retain in your second
“ edition of ‘ The Book of the Church,’ the story
“ of Bishop Gardiner and the Duke of Norfolk,
“ when, in fact, it was omitted.’ Your charge is
“ true. Permit me to mention how the circum-
“ stance happened.

“ I had perused your work in the first edition
“ of it, and noted the passage before the second
“ edition made its appearance. Having resolved
“ to answer your work, I desired Mr. Murray to
“ send me the second edition. He sent me the
“ first; and on my observing this to him, he told
“ me there was no difference between the editions,
“ no alteration having been made in the second.”
“ I however sent afterwards for it; but relying, as
“ you must be sensible I well might, on the infor-
“ mation which I had received from Murray,
“ I inserted in my Letters all the passages I had
“ noted in my first edition. Neither I, or any of
“ my friends had heard of the omission till now;
“ you could not be more astonished at the inser-

“ tion of the passage in my work, than I was at
“ what you say in your Preface, concerning the
“ omission. I am sorry for the mistake, and trust
“ I have explained it to your satisfaction. Mr.
“ Murray, if you apply to him, will I am sure
“ confirm this statement.

“ I am, Sir,

“ Your most obedient servant,

“ CHARLES BUTLER.”

Lincoln's-Inn,
February 1826.

By the return of post, Mr. Butler received from
Dr. Southey, the following reply:—

“ Sir,

“ Your explanation is perfectly satisfactory as
“ to the cause of the mistake, and requires no
“ confirmation from Mr. Murray. The omission
“ in question was the only alteration made in the
“ second edition, except that of a single word; and
“ it might easily slip from his memory in the
“ multiplicity of his concerns, especially as he
“ could attach no importance to it. That you
“ were misled in making the charge, I never
“ doubted; and if the *Vindiciæ* are reprinted, it
“ shall be stated there how the mistake arose.

“ The explanation itself is a further proof how
“ seriously we may be affected by accident in such
“ things.

“ I remain, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ ROBERT SOUTHEY.”

Dr. Southey's *Vindiciæ* is a Reply to a part only of Mr. Butler's " Book of the Roman Catholic Church : " he announces in it the probability of replying in the same spirit to the remaining part. Mr. Butler waits till then to publish a short answer to the whole.

Lincoln's Inn,

10 *March* 1826.

Luke Hansa
near Lincoln's-In

**Luke Hansard & Sons,
Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London.**

12461

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 451 216

2-12